DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 124 605 UD 016 052

AUTHOR	Rolling, Howard
TITLE	Project Success Environment: An Approach to Community Educational Improvement. End of Budget Report, Fiscal Year 1975.
INSTITUTION	Atlanta Public Schools, Ga.
SPONS AGENCY	Georgia State Dept. of Education, Atlanta.
REPORT NO	APS-PSE-12
PUB DATE	Aug 75
NOTE	94p.; Some parts may be marginally legible due to print quality of original
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Annual Reports; Behavior Change; Behavior Problems; *Class Management; Classroom Techniques; *Contingency Management; *Elementary Secondary Education; Information Dissemination; Inner City; Inservice Teacher Education; Preservice Education; *Program Evaluation; Student Behavior; *Teaching Methods; Urban Teaching
IDENTIFIERS	*Elementary Secondary Education Act Title III; ESEA Title III; *Georgia (Atlanta)

ABSTRACT

Between 1970 and 1973, Project Success Environment, funded under Elementary Secondary Education Act Title III developed an effective, low-cost classroom management program for use in grades one through eight of public schools. The program provides students with maximum opportunity to experience, on an individual basis, success in school. Teachers are trained to make their expectations clear, to emphasize, and reward appropriate social and academic behavior, to ignore most inappropriate behavior, and to minimize a student's opportunity for failure. At the end of the third year of funding, the program had been implemented in 61 classrooms of the Atlanta public School System, most of them located in inner city schools. Results consistently showed reduced disruptions, increased task involvement, and a positive, non-punitive classroom environment. During year Four of funding, the project staff developed and tested an exportation model of the Success Technique. For the Fifth year of funding, project staff wished to continue to attract new consumer schools, develop further the exportation model and evaluate the success of the program in a number of additional schools. A summary of the project's efforts to accomplish these objectives, with supporting details in four appendixes, constitutes the body of this report. (Author/JM)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED124605

PROJECT SUCCESS ENVIRONMENT: AN APPROACH TO COMMUNITY EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENT

End of Budget Report
Fiscal Year 1975

Prepared by
Dr. Howard Rollins

Project Director
Mr. Marion Thompson

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Dr. Sidney Estes
Assistant Superintendent
Instructional Planning and Development

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the Georgia Department of Education under the provisions of the U. S. Public Law 89-10, Title III, Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 as amended.

Project Success Environment
892 Vedado Way, N.E.
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

2

August, 1975
APS-PSE-12

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

UD 016 052

NARRATIVE REPORT

PROJECT STAFF

Mr. Marion Thompson
Director

Mrs. Jean Bowen
Exportation Coordinator

Mr. Bill Tygart
Behavior Management
Technician

Mrs. Sylvia Jones
Dissemination Coordinator

Mrs. Frances Arnold *
Success Teacher

Mrs. Sandra McAlister
Senior Stenographer

Mrs. Patricia Brittain *
Success Teacher

Mrs. Frances Ruth
Lead Teacher, Exportation

Mrs. Joycelyn Wilson *
Success Teacher

CONSULTANT

Dr. Howard Rollins
Emory University

*Paid from local funds.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PART I, NARRATIVE REPORT 1

PART II, APPENDICES 13

Appendix A - Exportation: Evaluation 13

Appendix B - New Atlanta Schools Trained: Evaluation 59

Appendix C - Description of In-Class Observation Procedure, and Report on Inter-rater Reliability for Year V. 79

Appendix D - Description of Implementation Checklist. 89

Over the three-year period between 1970 and 1973, Project Success Environment developed an effective, low-cost classroom management program for use in grades one through eight of public schools. The program, entitled "Positive Contingency Management," or more simply the "Success Technique," provides students with maximum opportunity to experience, on an individual basis, success in school. Teachers are trained to make their expectations clear, to emphasize, and reward appropriate social and academic behavior, to ignore most inappropriate behavior, and to minimize a student's opportunity for failure. At the end of the third year of funding, the program had been implemented in 61 classrooms of the Atlanta Public School System, most of them located in inner-city schools. Results consistently showed reduced disruptions, increased task involvement, and a positive, non-punitive classroom environment (A detailed description of the program and a summary of the results over three years are reported in the End-of-Budget Period Report FY 1973).

At the beginning of the fourth year of funding, the project possessed a program with the potential to meet the needs of a variety of schools and school systems, and with a cost factor making it feasible for most, if not all, school systems to adopt it.

During Year IV, the project staff developed and tested an exportation model of the Success Technique. Briefly, it was the strong belief of the staff that the program could be successfully implemented, and maintained if and only if the school principal played a major leadership role in the training, implementation, and on-going operation of the program at his school. Three schools, in which principals did implement the program, were systematically evaluated during Year IV. Two of these three schools were able to implement the program successfully with more positive teachers, less student disruptions, and more students attending to academic tasks.

Furthermore, the schools varied considerably in size and geographic location. It seemed clear at the end of Year IV that Positive Contingency Management could be successfully implemented, was cost effective, and produced dramatic changes in those schools where the principal took over major responsibility for training and implementation.

For Year V, project staff wished to continue attracting new consumer schools, develop further the exportation model, and evaluate the success of the program in a number of additional schools. The proposed objectives for Year V were:

1. to attract potential consumer schools, to export the program to these schools using the principal training model, and to evaluate the effectiveness of this exportation,
2. to disseminate at the local, regional, and national level both the nature and the effectiveness of the Success Technique. Moreover, during the course of Year V the project attempted to meet the following additional objectives:
3. to train additional volunteer elementary schools within the Atlanta Public School System, and
4. to maintain a core of the original success classes in order to have classrooms available both for visitation, and to provide practicum training for exportation teams from potential consumer schools.

A summary of the project's efforts to accomplish these four objectives follows immediately, with supporting details in Appendixes A, B, C, and D.

OBJECTIVE 1 - TO ATTRACT POTENTIAL CONSUMER SCHOOLS, TO EXPORT THE PROGRAM TO THESE SCHOOLS USING THE PRINCIPAL TRAINING MODEL, AND TO EVALUATE THE EFFECTIVENSS OF THIS EXPORTATION.

Often, innovative programs have produced effective outcomes, but then failed because they were either (a) too costly, (b) impractical for implementa-

tion in most schools, or (c) because no effective plan was developed for exporting the program. In most applications of contingency management (behavior modification) in school settings, a specialist trains a single teacher, and is then continually available to provide feedback, and to suggest changes in the program when failures occur. Clearly, time and expense prohibit the training of large numbers of teachers in this fashion. On the other hand, programs designed for group training in contingency management usually train teachers in isolation from the context in which they teach. Once trained, the teachers are expected to return to their schools, develop a program suiting their particular setting, implement the program, and assess its effectiveness with little assistance. This approach leads to many failures and to backsliding even when effective programs are developed.

Project Success Environment has developed viable solutions to the problems of cost-effective teacher training and exportation. In order to export the technique to other schools, and to guarantee that the program survives there beyond the first few months of implementation, the project has developed the "principal training exportation model." Essentially, a principal and two of his teachers are first trained by the project staff to apply the technique themselves, and then they are trained both to conduct a four-day workshop in their own school, and also, to administer, and oversee the implementation of the technique on a day-to-day basis.

Exportation Model

To teach interested principals the requisite knowledge and skills, the project established a training center at Grant Park Elementary School in Atlanta. Here the project conducted ten Training Workshops for Administrators during Year V. A total of 208 interested teachers, principals, assistant principals, State Department personnel, college persons; and other administra-

tors, directors, and supervisors from all over the state of Georgia, as well as a few from outside the State attended these workshops. Forty-five of the participants were Georgia elementary school principals who in most cases brought with them two volunteer teachers with leadership qualities. The project paid the travel, room, and board expenses for these leadership teams.

The workshops consisted of three-and-one-half hour sessions each morning over a period of four days. Instruction was given in three different formats: (1) Lecture and discussion based on readings in the theory of operant learning, which underlies positive contingency management - led by staff and consultant, (2) Practicum experiences, including classroom demonstration of the Success Technique, opportunity for each participant on two different occasions to teach for 20 minutes using aspects of the technique mastered at that point, and - for the principals - a chance to monitor and give feedback concerning proper implementation of the technique by a teacher, and (3) Small group discussions dealing with practical how-to problems and limitations of concern to the participants, including instruction and discussion with the principals concerning their training of their own faculties. Every principal who completed the training received a copy, and was instructed in the use of the Project Success Environment: Training Package for Principals, which provides detailed guidelines for a principal who wishes to train his own faculty in the Success Technique.

The version of the Success Technique adapted for exportation includes all aspects of the technique, except curriculum modifications, as they were developed in Year I-III. Thus, the local principal must oversee implementation of Classroom Rules, Ignore and Praise, a Token Reinforcement System, the Shelf, Activity Reinforcers, Reinforcement Record Charts, Time-out Procedures, Interest Stations, Activity Wheels, and in most cases an Activity Room (A detailed description of each of these components is given in Appendix A of the

End-of-Budget Period Report FY 1973). Many aspects are basically the individual teacher's responsibility, but the on-going administration and upkeep of the various aspects of the reinforcement system are clearly the responsibility of the principal.

The project proposed to establish the program in a number of schools throughout Georgia during Year V in order to showcase the Success Technique for all interested educators anywhere in the State. Twenty-one schools were initially set up. The principals and their two-teacher leadership-teams attended training workshops for administrators, were assisted by the project staff during their local training, and were given on-going monitoring support during initial implementation, and on a monthly basis thereafter.

The cost of establishing a demonstration school varied according to factors such as size and location of the school; but, a cost breakdown was made for a "typical" school. The total cost came to $1,600 and the cost per pupil was $2.85; however, most of the major expenses were borne by the project and none of the principals indicated that they were unable to obtain sufficient funds.

Evaluation

Evaluation of the exportation model during Year V centered on four basic questions. First, and foremost, the project staff wished to collect additional evidence that the Success Technique, when implemented properly by a principal, would provide substantial improvement in the behavior of teachers and students, and at a reasonable cost. In addition, an attempt was made to show that the program would continue to operate in the absence of support from project staff if the school principal was willing to assume a leadership role in training and implementation. Second, an attempt was made to determine how many potential consumer schools actually implemented all or part of the Success Technique. A questionnaire was mailed to 31 of 45 school principals attending the exportation workshop. The principals were asked to evaluate the three components

of the workshop, and answer questions related to their efforts to implement the technique in their schools. Third, the project staff developed and tested an instrument designed to be used to validate those schools attempting to implement the program. We wished to be able to state whether a particular consumer school had implemented with sufficient accuracy that the school could be properly called a Project Success School. Furthermore, we wished to create an instrument that could be filled out in a short period of time by a member of the project staff. The Implementation Checklist that is presented in Appendix D, and discussed in Appendix A is the result of these efforts. Finally, the fourth objective of the exportation evaluation was to assess systematically the effectiveness of the Administrators Training Workshop as a viable way to train interested principals and teachers. Each participant in the workshop was given a questionnaire to fill out, and tested their conceptual understanding of the basic concepts covered in the workshop.

Three schools that implemented the Success Technique under the guidance of their principal were systematically evaluated during Year V using the In-Class Observation procedure described in Appendix C. The results of this evaluation are presented in Appendix A. The first school evaluated, School A, implemented in late winter of 1974, and continued in operationd during Year V. Thus, this school provided an opportunity to assess the longevity of the Success Technique. In the Spring of 1975, observers returned to School A, and observed teacher and student behavior in five classes. The behavior of both teachers and students remained excellent, and substantially higher than prior to implementation. Furthermore, teachers were even more positive, and students less disruptive than just after implementation of the technique. Thus, it seems clear that with a strong and interested principal, the Success Technique can not only be implemented successfully, but can also be maintained for a substantial period of time, one year in this case.

Two schools, B and C, that implemented for the first time in Year V were also evaluated formally. Both schools are located in a small city in South Georgia. The entire group of elementary schools in the system implemented the program at the same time with supplemental funding with Title III monies from the State Department. As indicated by the detailed results in Appendix A, both schools B and C implemented the program successfully with substantial decreases in the level of teacher punishment, dramatic reductions in student disruptions, and large increases in student attention to academic exercises.

These additional data, to supplement those from Year IV, provide strong evidence that the Success Technique can be successfully exported to interested consumer schools.

Leadership teams from 45 Georgia elementary schools attended the project's ten training workshops for administrators; but, the project had no means available in Year V to systematically monitor subsequent activities in all these schools on a regular basis. Therefore, a questionnaire was developed by the project staff in order to obtain badly needed feedback. The questionnaire was mailed to 31 trained principals in May.

Nineteen of the 31 principals returned completed questionnaires, and the responses were encouraging. The principals reported that, after returning to their schools for several months, knowledge and experience gained at the workshop continued to help them. A majority followed through and trained or intended to train their faculties. The most pleasing information obtained from the questionnaires was the proportion of schools where a great majority of the several components of the Success Technique become operable by the end of Year V. The principals' responses constitute additional evidence that the principal training exportation model is a viable means for propagating the Success Technique throughout the state of Georgia (A copy of the Follow-up

Feedback Questionnaire for Principals, and a more complete reporting of the responses are included in Appendix A).

Many consumer schools implemented the Success Technique with little or no help from the project staff. When this happened, it was difficult to assess how well the schools actually followed the guidelines and concepts presented in the workshop. In order to assess and validate these schools, the Implementation Checklist was developed and used to rate schools implementing the program. The checklist is a rating scale as shown in Appendix D that enables a project staff member to rate a school on a variety of dimensions that project staff feel are essential if the school is to be considered a successful adopter of the program. Fourteen schools were rated using the Implementation Checklist. Everyone of these schools received an overall rating that was above average. In fact, eleven of the fifteen schools were given an overall rating well above average. These validation data provide more support for the effectiveness of the program. In many cases, principals without any support from the project have been able to return, train their teachers and implement successful programs. Some of these schools have programs that are as good as, or better than those schools where project staff have been available for consultative help.

Futhermore, the Implementation Checklist should be a useful instrument for determining whether future schools that implement the program have done so accurately and successfully.

Finally, an attempt was made in Year V to systematically evaluate the effectiveness of the Workshop for Administrators. Two methods were used to evaluate the workshops. First, each participant filled out an evaluation questionnaire, in which they were asked to rate the major components of the workshop for usefulness relative to other workshops attended. The responses to this questionnaire were uniformly high and enthusiastic. Over 85 percent

of the workshop participants rated the workshop as among the best they had ever attended, and most stated that they would be interested and willing to implement the program if sufficient funds could be found to do so. All major components of the workshop were given high ratings; particularly the demonstration and the practicum experiences that each participant received. Responses to each item of the questionnaire, and a detailed summary are presented in Appendix A.

At the end of each session, each participant was tested on his mastery of the concepts covered that day. We hypothesized that all participants would reach an 86 percent accuracy level overall on this conceptual material. The performance of participants on these tests met our objective for all three test days. In fact, except for the first day, all participants were above 90 percent accuracy on the major concepts covered in the workshop.

Thus, in general, the workshop appears to have met our objectives. The content is clearly mastered by the participants, and they not only like the format and content of the workshop, but also appear to be enthusiastic about the possibility of implementing the program in their local setting.

OBJECTIVE 2 - TO DISSEMINATE AT THE LOCAL, REGIONAL, AND NATIONAL LEVEL BOTH THE NATURE AND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE SUCCESS TECHNIQUE.

A major goal of the fifth year of funding was to heighten the visibility of the project and particularly the Success Technique at local, regional, and national levels. In order to meet this goal, two dissemination endeavors were undertaken during the fifth year. At the national level, the film was shwon at educational fairs held in California and New York. Regionally, the film was presented in Omaha, Nebraska, and Charlotte, North Carolina. The film was also shown to the Annual Conference of the Georgia Department of Elementary School Principals and the Florida Association of School Psychologist. In addition

the film has been shown to a large number of school personnel in the State of Georgia. In fact, the film has served as one device for exposing potential consumer schools to the values of the Success Technique. In addition to the film, a slide-audio cassette presentation developed during the second year, and revised during the fourth year of the project was presented to a number of interested groups throughout Georgia. Finally, a number of pamphlets were distributed to interested school administrators including principals, superintendents and curriculum directors. These pamphlets were given to all individuals who wrote the project requesting information, and to all individuals who visited the project.

A second major dissemination endeavor was to present the project in papers delivered at several conventions of educators and psychologists. Seven papers were delivered during the fifth year of funding. The Project Director delivered presentations to Educational Fairs held in Long Beach and San Francisco, California, and to the Georgia Association of Elementary School Principal's Annual Conference. The Project's two coordinators made presentations before the Annual Conference of Black Educators, Buffalo, New York. The Director also presented other papers to conferences held in Omaha, Nebraska, Charlotte, North Carolina, and Orlando, Florida. Finally a paper on Project Success was read at the Southeastern Convention of the American Psychological Association in Atlanta, Georgia, by the project consultant. In addition to these presentations at conventions, the project was reported in a number of professional journals. Some of these are to be included in new books currently in press (i.e., Urban Problems A Psychological Approach, Oxford University Press):

Rollins, H., McCandless, B., Thompson, M., & Brasell, W. "Project Success Experiment: An Extended Application of Contingency Management in Inner-City Schools." Journal of Educational Psychology, 1974, 66, 167-178.

Thompson, M., "Project Success Environment: One City's Approach to Learning." Discipline and Learning. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1975, pp. 120-124.

The third and remaining attempt to disseminate the project involved actual visitation of interested persons to the research base schools in Atlanta. Several schools in the Atlanta Public School System that had implemented the Success Technique received visitors during the fifth year of funding. There were in all approximately 385 visitors to project schools throughout the year. In addition 208 teachers and principals attended the principal training workshops designed to prepare them to implement the program in their own schools.

We believe that the above activities provided a high level of visibility for the project at local, regional, and national levels, and thus, conclude that the dissemination objective for the fifth year of funding was not only met but exceeded.

OBJECTIVE 3 - TO TRAIN ADDITIONAL VOLUNTEER ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS WITHIN THE ATLANTA PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM[1]

During Year V, the project staff introduced the Success Technique into ten additional elementary schools, one middle school, and one high school within the Atlanta Public School System. Responding to requests made by the principals, the staff trained teachers, and administrators, as well as other school personnel in the theory and use of the technique, and monitored implementation of the program on an on-going basis.

As part of the project's on-going monitoring activities, in-class observational data were collected in three of the twelve elementary schools - referred to herein as Schools D, E, and F on a pre-test, post-test basis. A random sample of from six to twelve classes were observed at each school.

[1]The Atlanta Public School System supported the implementation of the Success Project in these twelve schools. Five project staff persons were paid by local funds.

The results were quite positive at all three schools. Teachers showed increased reinforcement accompanied by dramatic drops in punishment. Furthermore, student disruptions were cut substantially, and student attention to academic excercises increased to acceptable levels. Clearly, the Success Technique continues to be a viable alternative to traditional teaching in large school systems.

An outline of the training and monitoring activities in the three schools, and a detailed discussion of data collection and analysis are presented in Appendix B.

OBJECTIVE 4 - TO MAINTAIN A CORE OF THE ORIGINAL SUCCESS CLASSES IN ORDER TO HAVE CLASSROOMS AVAILABLE BOTH FOR VISITATION, AND TO PROVIDE PRACTICUM TRAINING FOR EXPORTATION TEAMS FROM POTENTIAL CONSUMER SCHOOLS.

The project staff continued to monitor success operations at Sammye E. Coan Middle School, Whitefoord, Grant Park, and Kirkwood elementary schools. Success classes were maintained in these schools in order to have classrooms available both for visitation and to provide practicum training for exportation teams from potential consumer schools. Maintenance activities included: (1) training new teachers from the three schools in the Success Technique, and providing a refresher course for a number of experienced success teachers, and (2) regular visits by members of the project staff to the classrooms where notes were taken and the teachers given immediate feedback on their use of the Success Technique. While no formal evaluations were undertaken at these schools in Year V, project staff believe that these schools remain successful examples of the proper implementation of the Success Technique.

APPENDIX A

Exportation Model:

Evaluation

Tables for all analyses of variance reported herein are presented in the Attachment to Appendix A, and are not referenced in the text.

INTRODUCTION

During the first three years of funding, Project Success Environment developed an effective, low-cost classroom management program for use by teachers in grades one through eight of public schools. The program entitled, "Positive Contingency Management" or simply the "Success Technique," reduces disruptive student behavior, increases task involvement, and improves the attitude of students toward their school environment (For a description of the program and its development, and an evaluation of the results see End-of Budget Period Reports FY 1971-73).

In addition to developing the Success Technique, itself, the project staff created a model for exporting the technique to other schools. The model is based upon two major assumptions. First, teachers are not likely to continue using positive contingency management effectively without direct supervision and feedback from someone in their school; and, the school principal is the person to carry out such monitoring. Second, a principal, having received appropriate training from the project, can return to his own school and in turn train his faculty to utilize positive contingency management. During Year IV, this model was implemented and evaluated in three schools. The program was successfully implemented in two of the three schools reducing disruptive student behavior and increasing student envolvement (For a detailed evaluation of the implementation of the technique in these three schools see End-of Budget Period Report FY-74).

During Year V, project staff trained a number of additional leadership teams from consumer schools throughout Georgia. Ten regular, four-day workshops were held during the year. In all, 208 principals received training in the appli-

cation of Positive Contingency Management, and were prepared by the training to return to their schools to implement the program. The major exportation objectives for Year V were:

1. to further establish that the Principal-Exportation Model produces successful Positive Contingency Management programs, and, that with the local principal in a leadership role, these programs can continue in operation for a substantial period of time;
2. to determine the degree to which trained principals would implement the essentials of the program;
3. to validate those schools known to have attempted implementation of the program; and
4. to assess the effectiveness of the four-day workshop as a training program for principals and leadership teachers.

EXPORTATION MODEL

The exportation program employed for Year V was the same as the program developed in Year IV. Two portable classrooms at Grant Park Elementary School Atlanta wereused as a training center. Here the project conducted workshops (described immediately below) for 208interested teachers, principals, assistant principals, State Department personnel, college people; and other administrators, directors, and supervisors from all over the state of Georgia, as well as a few from outside the state. Success Classrooms at Grant Park were used to provide workshop participants both with a first-hand look at the Success Technique in operation, and with a setting in which they could readily practice the technique themselves.

Training Workshop for Administrators

The model requires that the principal understand the theory and use of positive contingency management and learn to monitor his teachers' application of it. Most principals attending the workshop brought two volunteer teachers who possessed leadership qualities with them to Atlanta. The project paid expenses of this leadership team including: mileage to and from the local school as well as from hotel to training center and return each day; hotel expenses; and meals not to exceed a total combined with hotel cost of $28 per day.

The workshop consisted of a two-and-one-half hour introductory session on Sunday night followed by three-and-one-half-hour sessions each day over a three day period. A schedule for a typical workshop is presented in Table 1. Instruction was given in three different formats:

1. lecture and discussion based on readings in the theory of operant learning, which underlies positive contingency management - led by staff and consultant;
2. practicum experiences, including classroom demonstration of the Success Technique, opportunity for each participant on two different occasions to teach for 20 minutes using aspects of the technique mastered at that point, and - for the principals - a chance to monitor and give feedback concerning proper implementation of the technique by a teacher; and
3. small group discussions dealing with practical how-to problems and limitations of concern to the participants, including instruction and discussion with the principals concerning the training of their own faculties.

TABLE I

Schedule for Four-Day Training Workshop for Administrators

Project SUCCESS Environment

****

Atlanta Internationale Hotel
450 Capitol Ave., SE
and
Grant Park Elementary School

750 Kalb Street, SE

DAY I - Sunday

7:00 - 7:25 (p.m.)	General Introduction: Brief introduction covering rationale, history, and accomplishment of PSE; Overview of workshop plans: Discuss requirements, purposes, and objectives
7:25 - 7:50	Slide Presentation
7:50 - 8:00	Discussion of Slide Presentation
8:00 - 8:45	Discussion of Becker materials - Staff will answer questions and summarize essential points.
8:45 - 9:00	Break
9:00 - 9:45	Small groups - Discuss Classroom Rules and Ignore and Praise Pass out mastery check - Discussion by participants in small groups. Fill out mastery check Announcements - Reading Assignments: Becker material - Practical problems and limitations[2] 1. Chapter III - Pages 26-30 2. Chapter V - Pages 54-60 3. Token Reinforcement[3] 4. Use of Activity Room[3] 5. Activity Reinforcers[3] 6. Behavior Management Checklist[3]

[2]Participants are expected to read materials prior to each day's session

[3]Locally produced by PSE Staff

TABLE I - Cont'd.:

DAY II - Monday

10:00 - 10:10	Discuss Items IA-IF of the Behavior Management Checklist
10:10 - 11:30	Demonstration and Discussion Break Incorporated
11:30 - 12:30	Discussion of Becker materials - Staff will answer questions and summarize essential points of previous day's reading 1. Chapter III - Pages 26-30 2. Chapter V - Pages 54-60
12:30 - 1:15	Discussion by participants in small groups concerning practical application of the following: 1. Token Reinforcement System[3] 2. Use of Activity Room[3] 3. Activity Reinforcers[3]
1:15 - 1:30	Pass out mastery check Announcements - Reading Assignments: Becker - Practical problems and limitations 1. Chapter IV - Pages 40-45 2. Chapter XII - Pages 153-159 3. Inhibition System

Note: The PSE Staff is available to discuss questions and problems with small groups or individuals.....the afternoon of DAY II or III.

TABLE I - Cont'd.:

DAY III - Tuesday

10:00 - 10:10	Discuss remainder of Behavior Management Checklist
10:10 - 11:15	Practicum for everyone Break Incorporated
11:15 - 12:15	Discussion of Becker materials 1. Chapter IV - Pages 40-45 2. Chapter XII - Pages 153-159
12:15 - 12:45	The Inhibition System
12:45 - 1:30	Discussion by participants in small groups concerning practical application of the Inhibition
1:30 - 1:45	Pass out mastery check Discussion by participants in small groups and fill out mastery check

Announcements - Reading Assignments:

1. Teachers' Checklist for Introducing Success Technique [3]
2. Reinforcement of Academic Behavior [3]
3. Use of Shelf [3]
4. Training Package (for Principals only) [3]

TABLE I - Cont'd.:

DAY IV - Wednesday

10:00 - 11:00	Use of Behavior Management Checklist by Administrators: Practicum for teachers
11:00 - 11:15	Visitation of Activity Room Break Incorporated
11:15 - 11:45	Small group discussion 1. Reinforcement of Academic Behavior[3] 2. Use of Shelf[3]
11:45 - 12:15	Theory Review
12:15 - 12:30	Why Children Fail
12:30 - 1:00	Use of Training Package: <u>For Principals</u> and other Administrators 1. Day I 3. Day III 2. Day II 4. Day IV Classroom management and practical application of Success Technique: For Teachers' Checklist
1:00 - 1:30	Feedback from Participants

Successful completion of the workshop required the participant to be on hand for all four sessions. Mastery checks were administered each of the first three days, testing the participant's understanding of the basic theoretical concepts covered. The participants corrected the mastery checks themselves, and, if appropriate, reviewed certain material a second time. Structured feedback was also part of the practicum experiences. Project staff observed the participants in action in the classroom setting and gave them individual feedback; in addition, each day's practicum was followed by a whole-group discussion.

Local Training

During the latter half of Year III, the project staff developed the Project Success Environment: Training Package for Principals, which provides detailed guidelines for a principal who wishes to train his own faculty in the Success Technique. Every principal who completes the training workshop for administrators receives a copy of the training package and is instructed in its use. Essentially the package outlines four half days of training similar to the training conducted by the project staff during a workshop for administrators. There is, however, less time devoted to theory and practicum experiences and more time provided for the mastery checks and the kinds of preparations a teacher must make before intorducing the Success Technique into the classroom. The package was reversed during the Summer, 1974 to provide principals with more structure for conducting the theoretical aspects of the workshop.*

Local Monitoring

Every principal who attends a workshop for administrators learns to use

*A copy of the revised Project Success Environment: Training Package for Principals accompanies this report in a separate binding.

the project's Behavior Management Checklist (see Appendix D of the End-of Budget Period Report, FY 1973). The instrument lists the specific, observable behaviors that a teacher must carry out regularly in order to properly implement the Success Technique. Using the Behavior Management Checklist, the principal observes in the classroom for 15 minutes, and is able to provide useful feedback to the teacher. The principal gives the teacher a completed copy of the checklist and arranges a brief follow-up discussion at the earliest possible time. Monitoring using the checklist is necessary on a daily basis during the first week or ten days of implementation, but can soon be reduced to once a week if no serious problems arise.

Implementation and Continuation Costs

The cost of establishing Positive Contingency Management in a school varies according to factors such as size and location of the school, but a cost breakdown for a "typical" school is presented in Table 2. Most of the major expenses were borne by the project, and none of the principals indicated that they were unable to obtain sufficient funds.

The last two items in Table 2 which cover the costs of assistance provided by project staff during implementation, and training have not been necessary for a number of schools. If the principal is a strong leader and confident of his understanding of the program, these expenses may be unwarranted, thus substantially reducing the actual cost of implementation. Furthermore, several principals were able to obtain supplies for the activity room for less than two-hundred and fifty dollars. Finally, continuation costs for operating the program are considerably less than for the first year. For a typical school, the program could be continued for approximately seventy-five (.75) cents per student. This figure would cover replacing broken or used items in the activity room, training teachers who have transferred into the school, and other miscellaneous costs relating to the reinforcement system.

TABLE 2

Cost Breakdown for Establishing a

20-Teacher Demonstration School

Activity	Cost
Attendance by Leadership Team at Training Workshop for Administrators	$ 300.00*
Materials Given Out or Expended during Training Workshop	10.00*
Reproduction of Materials for Local Training	10.00
Materials and Supplies Needed for Interest Stations	200.00
Equipment of Activity Room	250.00
Assistance Provided by Project Staff during Local Training	200.00*
On-going Monitoring Support by Project Staff (nine visits spread over regular school year)	630.00*
Total Cost	- $1,600.00
Cost Per Teacher	- 80.00
Cost Per Student	- 2.85

*Cost borne by Project Success

EVALUATION

Four objectives were established for exportation endeavors during Year V. First, and foremost, we wished to collect additional evidence to show that principals trained in the exportation workshops could in fact return to their school and implement a successful Positive Contingency Management program. Furthermore, it was deemed crucial that the program under the principal's leadership continue in operation for a reasonable period of time.

To this end, the programs in three schools were formally evaluated in Year V. The first school, here given the pseudonym of School A, was the only school remaining in operation of those that implemented and received formal evaluation during Year IV. The principals of the other two schools evaluated during Year IV were no longer there, one having retired; the other transferred to a different school in the district. Thus, School A provided the only opportunity to assess the effectiveness of the exportation model over an extended period of time. In addition, two other schools, both in a small South Georgia town, were evaluated. These two schools are the first from South Georgia to be evaluated and were among the first schools in the state to receive Title III monies to implement a nationally validated Title III program.

The second objective for Year V was to obtain a reasonable estimate of the percentage of principals receiving training, who actually implemented the essentials of the Success Technique. Thirty-one of the principals attending a workshop in Year V were sent a questionnaire to determine what components of the workshop were most helpful, and to what extent the components of the program were in operation in his school.

Our third objective was to assess the effectivenss of the program in as many schools as possible. Since formal, behavioral observations in the classes were not possible at each school, a checklist was devised that could

be filled out by a staff member in a single brief visit to a school. The checklist covered those components of the program that are deemed essential as well as an assessment of the degree to which principal and teachers are actually using the system. The checklist was employed in 14 schools over a three-month period near the end of Year V.

Finally, we attempted as our fourth objective, to assess the quality of the exportation workshop. Each participant was evaluated both on his understanding of the concepts presented and his ability to utilize the program in a project classroom. Furthermore, participants were asked to rate and comment on each component of the workshop from the perspective of their current position as principal (leader) and/or teacher.

The outcomes for each objective are presented below.

Objective I - Formal evaluation of the success of the program was undertaken in three schools. The evaluation consisted of the collection of data on the behaviors of samples of teachers and their students in the classroom both before and after implementation of the program by the principal.

School A - School A implemented the Success Technique in the winter of Year IV. The school (reported as School B in the End-of Budget Period Report FY 1974) was one of the three successful programs evaluated in Year IV. School A continued in operation during Year V, and thus, provided an opportunity to determine if the Success Technique would remain effective (with the principal in charge) for an extended period of time.

Subjects and Setting - School A is located in Rome, Georgia, a rather large city in the Northwest corner of the state. With over twenty classes, this school is a bit larger than the average Georgia elementary school, and has a student population from a wide range of socio-

economic backgrounds.

Training and Monitoring - The principal and two volunteer teachers attended the project's training workshop in January, 1974 (Year IV). Then, in early March, this leadership team trained the school's entire faculty following closely the guidelines contained in the training package. Members of the project staff were present during the local training and put on a classroom demonstration of the Success Technique during the first day's session. Staff members continued to visit School A approximately one day a month during the remainder of the school year. They discussed the progress of the program with the principal, pointed out potential problem areas, and, at his direction, visited and gave feedback to individual teachers. Occasionally during Year V, staff members visited this school, but such visits became less frequent during the year and were clearly unnecessary.

Observation - Observations were made in a sample of five classes in grades one through three. Volunteer parents were taught to use the standard in-class observation procedure (see Appendix C) by the project staff. The parents observed the five classes during a two-week period in February, 1974, before local training, during a two-week period in May, 1974, and again in February, 1975, after the Success Technique had been operational for one year.

Analysis and Design - For purposes of analysis the six to nine observations of each class obtained during each observational interval were divided into three blocks (1, 2 or 3 sequential observations per block). An average score was then taken within each block for a given dependent variable (either reinforcement, punishment, disruption, or per-cent time on task). This block variable was used in an analysis

of variance design to determine if changes occurred within each observation interval as well as between one interval and the next.

Results - The means for all four behaviors at each observation interval are presented in Table 3. The teachers more than doubled their rate of reinforcement immediately after training in the use of the technique, $F(1,8) = 28.12$, $p < .01$. One year later, the teachers were still reinforcing at nearly double the rate prior to implementation, a difference that was also statistically significant, $F(1,8) = 11.25$, $p < .01$. The teachers also cut their punishment rate in half following implementation of the program, but this difference did not quite reach significance, $F(1,8) = 3.53$, $p > .05$. One year later, these teachers had reduced their level of punishment further and the difference between pre observation and one year later was reliable, $F(1,8) = 5.08$, $p < .05$.

Concomitant with the changes in teacher behavior, student behavior also showed marked improvement. The rate of student disruption decreased to one-third the level prior to implementation, $F(1,8) = 14.85$, $p < .01$, and dropped even further one year later, $F(1,8) = 20.36$, $p < .01$. Further, students spent considerably more time on assigned exercises following implementation moving from 76 percent involved to 85 percent involved just after implementation, $F(1,8) = 6.02$, $p < .05$, and remained that high one year later, $F(1,8) = 7.37$, $p < .05$.

Summary - Thus, the exportation of the Success Technique into School A resulted in substantial and statistically reliable improvement in both teacher and student behavior. Furthermore, these positive changes were still present or even improved one year following imple-

TABLE 3

Mean Teacher and Student Behavior in Five Classes
at School A
Before, Immediately After Training, and One Year Later

Behavior Observed	Before Training February, 1974	After Training May, 1974	After Training Jan., 1975
Teacher Behavior			
Reinforcement Per Student (15 min.)	0.48	1.02*	0.79*
Total Punishment (15 min.)	2.00	0.97	0.77*
Student Behavior			
Disruptions Per Student (15 min.)	0.48	0.15*	0.09*
Per Cent Time on Task	76.2	84.7*	86.3*

*Statistically significant change in this behavior from pre-test.

mentation. The latter result confirms one of our more important hypotheses: With the principal in a leadership role, the program can be effectively maintained for a substantial period of time, at least for one full year.

Schools B/C - Formal evaluation of the principal model was also accomplished at two additional schools during Year V. These two schools, here labeled Schools B and C, were the first programs implemented in the Sourthern part of the state to receive formal evaluation. Further, these were two of six schools in the Waycross School System to implement with supplemental funding under Title III monies.

Subjects and Setting - Both Schools B and C are elementary schools of the school system of Waycross, Georgia, a small town in the Southeastern section of Georgia. Both schools are approximately average in size having approximately 16 teachers. One of these schools serves predominantly lower socio-economic level children; the other middle-class.

Training and Monitoring - The principals of each school and two volunteer teachers from each school attended the workshop for administrators in late Spring, 1974. Then, in October, these two leadership teams trained the entire faculties of both schools simultaneously. A project staff member and a consultant were present during the training workshop, and provided some assistance in the training. However, the two principals were leaders of the training and presented the bulk of the material themselves. An interesting aspect of this particular workshop was that the Project Slide presentation was shown on the local Educational Television station (WXGA-TV, Channel 8) so workshops in five different schools in the system could occur at the same time. Two staff

members continued to visit these two schools approximately once a month during the remainder of the school year. They pointed out potential problem areas, and, at the principals' direction, visited and gave feedback to individual teachers. Staff persons also visited the three remaining schools in Waycross on a routine basis.

Observation - Observations were made in a random sample of six classes at each school both in September, and again after training and implementation in February and March. Two local teacher aides were trained by a consultant to use the standard in-class observational procedure (see Appendix C). From four to six observations were made in each classroom just prior to implementation and approximately six weeks following implementation. Reliabilities between the two observers and with the project consultant were uniformly high and are reported in Appendix C.

Analysis and Design - For purposes of analysis, four observations on each class were selected randomly from the total number of observations at each observation interval. For some classes, only four observations were possible. For those classes that were observed more than four times, the additional data were simply dropped from consideration. The four observations of each class were then used in analysis of variance design to determine if changes occurred within the before or after training periods as well as between one period and the next.

Results - Results of program implementation at Schools B and C are presented in Table 4 for all four behavioral measures. At School B, there was a reliable and truly large drop in the rate of punishment from over six punishments per fifteen minute interval to less than two per interval, $F(1,5) = 9.99$, $p < .05$; a more than 50 percent drop in the level of disruptions, $F(1,5) = 13.21$, $p < .01$; and a reliable increase in student

involvement from 70.9 percent involved to 78.7 percent involved, $F(1,5) = 4.48$, $p < .05$. Of the six classes involved at School B, five showed improvement in punishment, disruptions, and student involvement. At School C, there was a 60 percent drop in punishment, $F(1,5) = 224.55$, $p < .01$; a reliable 38 percent drop in disruptions, $F(1,5) = 5.03$, $p < .05$; and a 20 percent increase in student involvement, $F(1,5) = 19.29$, $p < .01$. Four of the six classes at School C changed on these three measures in the appropriate direction. Few of the teachers at either School B or C changed much in frequency of reinforcement, but this frequency was already higher than in most schools we have observed. Further, the drop in punishment was much higher at these two schools than is typically observed.

Summary - Positive Contingency Management was successfully implemented in these two South Georgia elementary schools. The results were to produce considerable changes in both teacher and student behaviors in the classroom. These results suggest tentatively that the program will work as effectively in that part of the state as it has elsewhere.

TABLE 4

Teacher and Student Behavior in Six Classes Each of Two Elementary Schools in South Georgia before and after Training in Positive Contingency Management by their Principals (Fall, 1974).

	School B		School C	
	Before	After	Before	After
Teacher Behavior				
Mean Reinforcements per Student	0.62	0.67	0.55	0.70
Mean Total Punishments	6.25	1.71*	4.46	1.79*
Student Behavior				
Mean Disruptions per Student	1.09	0.46*	1.49	0.93*
Mean Percentage Students Involved	70.9	79.7*	64.7	77.0*

*Difference between Before and After reliable at $p < .05$.

Objective II - To determine to what extent the Success Technique was in use in the schools of those principals attending the Workshop for Administrators.

Leadership teams from 45 Georgia elementary schools attended the project's nine training workshops for administrators; but, the project had no means available in Year V to systematically monitor subsequent activities in these schools on a regular basis. Therefore, the questionnaire presented in Table 5 was developed by the project staff in order to obtain badly needed feedback. The questionnaire was mailed to 31 principals in May, 1974, with a cover letter explaining the purpose of the questionnaire and assuring anonymity.

Nineteen of the 31 principals returned completed questionnaires. This sample of respondents is probably biased toward principals who implemented the program successfully. Nevertheless, the responses are encouraging. The principals reported that, after returning to their schools for several months, the knowledge and experience gained at the workshop continued to help them (item I). Forty-two percent followed through and trained their faculties (item II, A), and an additional 21 percent plan to begin in 1975-76. Most of them reported that the Project Success Environment: Training Package for Principals was extremely helpful (item II, B). The most pleasing information obtained was the proportion of schools where a great majority of the several components of the Success Technique were operative at the end of the school year (item II, E). The principals' responses constitute additional evidence that

TABLE 5

FOLLOW-UP FEEDBACK QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PRINCIPALS

I. As you look back on our four-day workshop, we would like to know what you think of the workshop in retrospect. Please rate each activity listed below on a scale from 1 to 5 - where 1 indicates that the activity has proven to be of no help to you at all now that you are back in your own school, and 5 indicates that the activity gave you knowledge or experience that now helps you greatly every day:

	Average for 19 Respondents
Whole-Group Theory Presentation and Discussion	
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5	4.05
Practicum Using the Success Technique	
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5	4.12
Small-Group Discussions	
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5	4.06
The Workshop as a Whole	
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5	4.35

If there is some other activity that you engaged in during the workshop that you strongly feel should be included in, or excluded from future workshops, please mention it here: e.g., "The practicum should be longer with more follow up."

TABLE 5 - Cont'd.

II. If you have tried to introduce the Success Technique into some or all of the classrooms in your school, please give us the following information: (If you decided not to introduce the technique, please answer question IV.)

A. Did you, yourself, train your teachers in the use of the Success Technique? Yes 8 No 4

B. If so, how helpful was the Project Success Environment: Training Package for Principals? e.g., "Absolutely Necessary

C. Have you used the Behavior Management Checklist to give your teachers feedback? Yes 5 No 8

D. If so, how often do you use the checklist, and how helpful has it been? e.g., "Helpful in initial stages - not needed nearly as much now." (Twice/week to one time)

E. Please check those aspects of the Success Technique that are now operative in your target classrooms:

	Operative	Not Operative
☐ Classroom Rules	12	0
☐ Ignore and Praise	11	1
☐ Token Reinforcement System	7	4
☐ Shelf	10	0
☐ Activity Reinforcers	10	1
☐ Reinforcement Record Chart	6	5
☐ Time Out	8	3
☐ Interest Stations	12	0
☐ Activity Wheels	8	3

TABLE 5 - Cont'd.

F. Have you used an Activity Room as the major back up for the reinforcement system? Yes 5 No 6

G. If not, what else have you used and with what success? e.g., "Free time to listen to tapes, go to library, use slide projector, look at TV, etc." (outside play, back-of-room activities)

III. We would greatly appreciate it, if you would take the time to briefly relate for us either some particular problem that you have encountered while implementing the Success Technique or some interesting positive anecdote that occurred as a result of implementing the technique: e.g., ".....Have succeeded in motivating the two low achieving groups in both 4th and 5th grades, and that's an accomplishment. We feel as though we have 'reached' them so that we can teach them and get some learning started."

IV. If you decided not to introduce the Success Technique into your school, please tell us why you chose not to. (Your frankness will be appreciated.) e.g., "We are already into a similar program. Teachers felt problems were not strong enough to warrant. We will use part of the program in future staff development."

V. Number of Teachers using Technique 93

Total Number of Pupils in Success Classes 2,215; ALL in elementary schools.

the exportation model is a viable means for propagating the Success Technique throughout the state of Georgia. Further, as can be seen in Item V, in those schools that have reported implementing, nearly 100 teachers are using the program with over 2,200 students.

Objective III - During Year V, the project staff decided to develop an instrument that could be used to assess the effectiveness of any implementation endeavor by a total school during a single half-day or less visit to a school. The instrument was developed in January, pilot tested, revised and finally employed to validate several schools inside and outside Georgia. The instrument, entitled "Implementation Checklist," is printed in Appendix D along with objective descriptions of the various criteria and scoring procedures. For each category, the school or teacher is rated on a scale from 1 (poor or not implemented) to 5 (excellent implementation). The scale is divided into two major sections. The first section is used to assess the degree to which the Success Technique is successfully implemented school-wide. In this section, ratings are made of the leadership role played by the principal as overall supervisor of the reinforcement system, as monitor and feedback agent to teachers using the system, and as the individual responsible for keeping the system operating, and the staff motivated to maintain the system. This segment of the Implementation Checklist was used to evaluate only two schools. The results of these evaluations are presented in Table 6. Both schools are located in north Georgia, and have been using the Success Technique for approximately one year. Project staff consider these two schools to be good examples of the successful implementation of the program. It is evident in Table 6 that the two schools rate high in overall implementation of the program. Both schools have top ratings in every category except for the time that the principal spends observing

TABLE 6

PROJECT SUCCESS ENVIRONMENT

I. School-wide Implementation of Success Technique

	Principal				Backup Reinforcement System				
School	Time in Class	Leadership	Monitors Reinforcement	Motivation of Staff	Frequency of Use of A.R.	Age Related Reinforcers	Supv. of A.R.	Maintenance of A.R.	Effective Reinforcers
1	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
2	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
			Average/Category	4.75 4.75					5.0 5.0

Overall Rating of School Based on All Categories 4.87
4.87

in the teachers' classroom. Both principals expressed concern over their lack of time to observe teachers and provide feedback on their successful implementation of the program. Thus, these two schools rate high in overall implementation of the program, and the objective ratings fit well with our subjective impressions of the effectivenss of operation in these two schools.

The major difficulty with this first segment of the checklist is that most project staff feel some reluctance to rate the principal of the school fearing that a low rating in one or more categories may alienate the principal and interfer with the staff member's ability to suggest and produce improvement. This particular problem is currently being considered with some anticipated changes in the instrument, or in the selection of which project staff members are used to evaluate the schools. One solution to this problem is for the project director to assume this responsibility.

The second segment of the Implementation Checklist provides a rating for each classroom in a school in three general categories: (a) teacher behavior (whether the teacher is positive, consistent, and has good attitude about the program), (b) Pupil (whether pupils are on tasks, seem motivated, and understand system), and (c) the classroom (whether pupils are subgrouped, the wheels are in use, interest stations are visible, and a reinforcement chart is on a wall). The classrooms at a number of schools have been rated using the second segment of the checklist. The average rating of teachers at each school are presented in Table 7. The first two schools in Table 7

are the ones for which school-wide ratings were completed (see Table 6). The ratings in all categories are above average (3) for every school, and the first ten schools have overall ratings above (4) indicating above average implementation in all categories. Thus, these data on classroom implementation of the Success Technique at 14 schools throughout Georgia indicate that the program is working well in at least 70 percent of the schools upon which the Implementation Checklist was used. It is important to note that this checklist was used in schools other than those that were evaluated by use of in-class observation procedures. We believe that this instrument will be a valuable tool for determining objectively whether or not a particular school is successful in its use of the program since the instrument requires only a single visit to the school and approximately 15 minutes in a sample of the classrooms of the school. The checklist will be used in the future to validate those schools that elect to implement the program.

TABLE 7

Classroom Implementation of the Success Technique in 14 Schools in Georgia
(Rating for each Category is Average for Teachers Observed at that School)

School	No. Tchrs.	Teacher			Pupil			Classroom			
		Positive	Consistent	Attitude	On Task	Motivated	Understands System	Sub Group	Wheel	Station	Reinf. Chart
1	7	4.43	4.14	4.43	3.73	4.14	4.28	4.86	5.00	4.57	4.28
2	7	4.57	4.57	4.57	4.43	4.43	4.57	5.00	3.28	3.28	3.73
3	5	4.20	2.80	5.00	4.60	4.20	----	4.00	4.60	3.40	5.00
4	5	4.40	4.20	4.40	4.60	4.20	4.20	4.20	4.20	4.20	4.20
5	5	4.60	4.40	5.0	4.20	4.60	4.60	4.70	5.00	4.60	3.20
6	4	5.00	4.50	5.00	4.75	4.75	5.00	4.00	5.00	4.00	5.00
7	6	4.67	4.50	4.67	5.00	5.00	4.83	5.00	5.00	5.00	4.17
8	8	4.37	4.25	4.25	4.25	4.25	4.37	4.37	4.25	4.25	4.25
9	6	4.83	3.50	4.83	3.50	3.67	4.33	5.00	4.33	5.00	5.00
10	11	4.36	3.73	4.36	4.09	3.82	4.54	3.45	3.45	3.35	4.09
11	7	3.85	3.71	3.85	3.71	4.43	4.28	3.85	3.85	3.85	4.70
12	5	4.00	3.60	4.20	4.00	4.20	5.00	3.20	3.40	3.40	5.00
13	21	3.62	3.90	3.86	4.10	4.10	4.33	3.67	3.52	3.52	3.43
14	13	3.54	3.15	3.31	3.54	3.46	4.53	3.46	3.46	3.31	4.00

Objective IV - An attempt was made during Year V to determine how effective the administrators' workshop was as a means of (a) teaching the concepts and practical knowledge required to implement the program, (b) interesting participants in implementing all or part of the program. To this end, two types of evaluation were undertaken which dealt with the evaluation of the workshops by workshop participants. First, each participant filled out an evaluation questionnaire following the workshop to provide us with immediate feedback concerning the participant's perception of the workshop in these two areas. Second, each participant was tested on his knowledge of the concepts presented during the workshop. Our objective was that each participant reach a level of 86 percent accuracy on the material presented.

The results of each of these test instruments are reported below:

(1) Workshop Evaluation Questionnaire - Sixty teachers, 31 administrators, and 15 others filled out the Workshop Evaluation Questionnaire at the end of the workshop.[4] The questionnaire, and the responses of each type of participant are presented in Table 8. Participants' overall reactions to the workshop were uniformly high. Over 80 percent of the participants in all three categories rated the workshop as either one of the better, or the best workshop they had ever attended (see Overall Impressions, Table 8). Over 75 percent of the teachers and 90 percent of the administrators reported that they would like to implement the program in their class or school. Over 75 percent of all

[4]The questionnaire was not available for use until the December workshop. Thus, responses are not available for these participants.

TABLE 8

Responses of Participants to Workshop for Administrators Questionnaire
(Responses of 60 Teachers, 31 Administrators, and 15 Others)

I. Presentation of the theoretical concepts underlying Positive Contingency Management

(a) How clearly were the concepts presented?

	Teacher	Administrator	Other
Not at All			
Fairly Clear		10%	
Reasonably Clear	40%	42%	20%
Quite Clear	60%	48%	80%
Extremely Clear			

(b) Do you think that the concepts presented are useful to your application of the program in the classroom?

Of no use at all			
Fairly Useful	02%	04%	
Useful	58%	55%	20%
Very Useful	40%	41%	80%
Extremely Useful			

(c) Should we spend more or less time discussing the theoretical concepts?

More	21%	32%	
Less	16%	09%	20%
No Response	25%	13%	
Same	38%	45%	60%

(d) Were the mastery checks and review sessions of any help?

Yes	73%	77%	60%
No	17%	12%	06%
No Response	10%	11%	34%

(e) Give any suggestions you may have for improving the theoretical discussion.

No Response	75%	52%	86%

II. The Classroom Demonstration conducted by a member of the Project Staff

(a) Did the demonstration help clarify how the program actually operated in the classroom?

Yes	83%	68%	73%
No	01%	07%	
No Response	16%	25%	27%

TABLE 8 - Cont'd.

(b) How useful did you find the demonstration?

	Teacher	Administrator	Other
Of no use at all			
Fairly Useful	03%		
Useful	08%	10%	14%
Very Useful	33%	42%	20%
Extremely Useful	58%	48%	66%

(c) Is the demonstration sufficiently long or would you prefer that more or less time be given to it?

More	26%	29%	13%
No Response	17%	16%	33%
Less	05%		
Same	52%	55%	53%

(d) Give suggestions you may have about improving the demonstration.

No Response	58%	48%	87%
None	18%	19%	

III. Small Group Discussions

(a) How well did the small group discussion cover the practical problems of implementing the program in the classroom or in the school (administrators)?

Not well at all			
Fairly Well	08%	12%	06%
Sufficient Coverage	18%	16%	13%
Very Well	33%	63%	53%
Extremely Well	41%	09%	27%

(b) Were the staff members in small group discussions helpful in clearing up confusions about how to implement, and operate the program in the classroom?

Not helpful at all		03%	
Fairly Helpful	05%		
Helpful	11%	16%	08%
Very Helpful	36%	45%	46%
Extremely Helpful	48%	32%	46%
No Response		03%	

(c) Would you prefer more or less time devoted to small group discussions?

More	40%	42%	67%
Less	18%	08%	
Same	25%	41%	13%
No Response	17%	09%	06%

TABLE 8 - Cont'd.

(d) Give any suggestions you have concerning improvement of small group discussion.

	Teacher	Administrator	Other
No Response	52%	55%	100%

(e) Are there topics that were not covered in small group discussions that you would like to have been covered?

No Response	52%	42%	100%

IV. Observation of "live classrooms" using positive contingency management, and participation in practicum

(a) How useful was the observation of teachers actually applying the program?

Not useful at all			
Fairly Useful		01%	06%
Useful	18%	22%	06%
Very Useful	31%	48%	33%
Extremely Useful	38%	19%	53%
No. Response	13%	10%	02%

(b) How useful was participation in the practicum?

Not useful at all			
Fairly Useful	05%	01%	06%
Useful	12%	16%	06%
Very Useful	22%	52%	40%
Extremely Useful	52%	[illegible]%	40%
No Response	10%	03%	08%

(c) Did the observations and practicum clarify the ideas discussed in the theoretical portion and in small group discussions?

Not at all			
A little			
Some	13%	12%	07%
A Lot	35%	45%	13%
A Great Deal	47%	41%	73%
No Response	05%	02%	07%

(d) Would you prefer more or less time spent in:

1. Observation of experienced teacher

More	50%	55%	40%
Less	03%		
Same	22%	29%	20%
No Response	25%	16%	40%

TABLE 8 - Cont'd.

2. Participation in a practicum

	Teacher	Administrator	Other
More	35%	48%	40%
Less	12%		
Same	18%	26%	20%
No Response	35%	24%	40%

(e) What suggestions do you have concerning the observation and the practicum components of the workshop?

No Response	39%		67%

Overall Impressions

(a) Please rate below your overall impression of the workshop.

A waste of time			
I've been to better workshops			
About Average	08%	15%	
One of the better (more useful)	35%	46%	40%
The best (Why)	47%	39%	60%

(b) Would you like to implement Positive Contingency Management?

Yes	75%	90%	100%
No	06%		
No Response	19%	10%	

(c) Do you think you learned enough to attempt to implement the program in your classroom or school, assuming that you had some help from our staff?

Yes	78%	87%	87%
No	06%	03%	
No Response	16%	10%	13%

(d) What would be the biggest drawback to implementing the program in your setting?

Money
Other

(e) Give any suggestions or comments you have about the operation of the workshop. Was it well organized? Were the staff helpful and pleasant? In general, were there inconveniences that could be corrected?

participants felt that they had learned enough from the workshop to implement in their local setting. The biggest drawback to implementation listed was financial resources.

Participants were also asked to rate each of the four major components of the workshop: the theoretical presentation, the classroom demonstration, small group discussions, and the practicum experience in a Project Success classroom. Virtually all of the participants felt that the theoretical presentation was clear and well presented, and most felt that the staff should devote at least as much or more time to theoretical concepts than is currently spent on this area. Over 70 percent of the participants felt that the demonstration clarified the operation of the program, and over 90 percent felt that the demonstration was very useful. Over three quarters of the participants indicated that the small group discussions were very helpful in covering the practical problems of implementation of the program in the local setting. Finally, between 75 and 85 percent of the participants rated the practicum as very or extremely useful, and approximately the same proportions felt that the workshop should continue to offer at least the same or more time to this component.

Summary - It is clear from this questionnaire that the workshop is deemed a worthwhile experience immediately after the workshop ends. The participants like the

way the workshop is organized, like the components, and believe that they have received enough information to implement the program. Thus, we conclude that the workshop is successful in the sense that the participants enjoy it, and feel that it has accomplished what we want it to.

(2) Knowledge of Theoretical Concepts - At the end of the first three days of the workshop, each participant gave written answers to open-ended questions designed to test their basic understanding of the theoretical concepts covered during that day. The responses of a sample of one-half of all tests were scored for accuracy (40 tests per day). The results are straightforward. The project objective was that each participant meet, or exceed 85 percent mastery of each day's material. For the first day's test, 38 out of 40 scored papers exceeded the 85 percent mastery level. On the remaining two days' tests, all 40 scored tests were above the mastery level with mean percentages of 95 correct for Day II, and 99 correct for Day III. Clearly, all participants performed well on the theoretical concepts presented, and by the end of the workshop had learned enough about the conceptual foundations of the project to enable them to implement the program in their schools.

ATTACHMENT TO APPENDIX A

Analyses of Variance Tables for in-class Observational Data Discussed

in

Appendix A

Analyses of Variance: School A

Teacher Behavior

REINFORCEMENTS PER STUDENT (15 minutes)

Source	df	Mean Square	F
Mean	1	26.37	
Treatment	2	1.10	17.18**
Pre vs. Post	1	1.80	28.12**
Pre vs. One Year Later	1	.72	11.25**
Blocks	2	0.11	1.37
Teacher	4	1.47	
Treatment x Blocks	4	0.007	1.0
Treatment x Teacher	8	0.06	
Blocks x Teacher	8	0.07	
Treatment x Blocks x Teacher	16	0.09	

TOTAL PUNISHMENTS (15 minutes)

Source	df	Mean Square	F
Mean	1	69.69	
Treatment	2	6.57	2.93
Pre vs. Post	1	7.95	3.53
Pre vs. One Year Later	1	11.32	5.00*
Blocks	2	0.09	1.0
Teacher	4	6.57	
Treatment x Blocks	4	1.46	1.0
Treatment x Teacher	8	2.25	
Blocks x Teacher	8	1.01	
Treatment x Blocks x Teacher	16	1.40	

*$p < .05$

**$p < .01$

Analyses of Variance: School A

Student Behavior

DISRUPTIONS PER STUDENT (15 minutes)

Source	df	Mean Square	F
Mean	1	2.57	
Treatment	2	0.68	11.33**
Pre vs. Post	1	0.82	14.85**
Pre vs. One Year Later	1	1.12	20.36**
Blocks	2	0.03	1.50
Teacher	4	0.10	
Treatment x Blocks	4	0.01	1.00
Treatment x Teacher	8	0.06	
Blocks x Teacher	8	0.02	
Treatment x Blocks x Teacher	16	0.01	

PER CENT TIME ON TASK

Source	df	Mean Square	F
Mean	1	305539.19	
Treatment	2	442.87	6.02**
Pre vs. Post	1	541.88	7.37**
Pre vs. One Year Later	1	765.00	10.39**
Blocks	2	34.20	1.66
Teacher	4	401.92	
Treatment x Blocks	4	25.47	1.0
Treatment x Teacher	8	73.51	
Blocks x Teacher	8	20.59	
Treatment x Blocks x Teacher	16	30.77	

*$p < .05$

**$p < .01$

Analyses of Variance: School B

Teacher Behavior

REINFORCEMENTS PER STUDENT (15 minutes)

Source	df	Mean Square	F
Mean	1	20.060	
Treatment	1	0.032	0.471
Blocks	3	0.017	0.163
Teacher	5	0.56	
Treatment x Blocks	3	0.158	1.436
Treatment x Teacher	5	0.068	
Blocks x Teacher	15	0.104	
Treatment x Blocks x Teacher	15	0.110	

TOTAL PUNISHMENTS (15 minutes)

Source	df	Mean Square	F
Mean	1	760.021	
Treatment	1	247.521	9.99*
Blocks	3	27.632	2.10
Teacher	5	10.471	
Treatment x Blocks	3	9.910	1.92
Treatment x Teacher	5	24.771	
Blocks x Teacher	15	13.149	
Treatment x Blocks x Teacher	15	5.159	

*$p < .05$

**$p < .01$

Analyses of Variance: School B

Student Behavior

DISRUPTIONS PER STUDENT (15 minutes)

Source	df	Mean Square	F
Mean	1	29.218	
Treatment	1	4.807	13.21**
Blocks	3	0.832	2.33
Teacher	5	3.656	
Treatment x Blocks	3	1.161	2.60
Treatment x Teacher	5	0.364	
Blocks x Teacher	15	0.357	
Treatment x Blocks x Teacher	15	0.446	

PER CENT TIME ON TASK

Source	df	Mean Square	F
Mean	1	268801.31	
Treatment	1	720.750	4.473
Blocks	3	267.056	1.53
Teacher	5	1501.936	
Treatment x Blocks	3	339.472	1.42
Treatment x Teacher	5	161.151	
Blocks x Teacher	15	173.788	
Treatment x Blocks x Teacher	15	239.329	

*$p < .05$

**$p < .01$

Analyses of Variance: School C

Teacher Behavior

REINFORCEMENTS PER STUDENT (15 minutes)

Source	df	Mean Square	F
Mean	1	18.825	
Treatment	1	0.249	1.051
Blocks	3	0.337	3.51
Teacher	5	1.011	
Treatment x Blocks	3	0.444	3.70*
Treatment x Teacher	5	0.236	
Blocks x Teacher	15	0.096	
Treatment x Blocks x Teacher	15	0.120	

TOTAL PUNISHMENTS (15 minutes)

Source	df	Mean Square	F
Mean	1	468.75	
Treatment	1	85.333	222.80**
Blocks	3	5.139	1.037
Teacher	5	13.70	
Treatment x Blocks	3	3.167	1.180
Treatment x Teacher	5	0.383	
Blocks x Teacher	15	4.956	
Treatment x Blocks x Teacher	15	2.683	

*$p < .05$

**$p < .01$

Analyses of Variance: School C

Student Behavior

DISRUPTIONS PER STUDENT (15 minutes)

Source	df	Mean Square	F
Mean	1	70.324	
Treatment	1	3.741	5.053*
Blocks	3	0.724	1.890
Teacher	5	1.884	
Treatment x Blocks	3	3.272	8.611**
Treatment x Teacher	5	0.743	
Blocks x Teacher	15	0.383	
Treatment x Blocks x Teacher	15	0.380	

PER CENT TIME ON TASK

Source	df	Mean Square	F
Mean	1	240975.00	
Treatment	1	1837.69	19.23**
Blocks	3	12.187	0.16
Teacher	5	1514.42	
Treatment x Blocks	3	148.19	1.06
Treatment x Teacher	5	95.58	
Blocks x Teacher	15	75.92	
Treatment x Blocks x Teacher	15	139.35	

*$p < .05$

**$p < .01$

APPENDIX B

New Atlanta Schools Trained

Evaluation

Tables for all analyses of variance reported herein are presented in the Attachment to Appendix B, and are not referenced in the text.

During Year V, the project staff introduced the Success Technique into ten additional elementary schools within the Atlanta Public School System. Responding to requests made by the principals, the staff trained teachers, administrators, as well as other school personnel in the theory and use of the technique and monitored implementation of the program on an on-going basis. By the end of the school year the technique was operational in a number of classes at all ten schools.

As part of the project's on-going monitoring activities, in-class observational (ICO) data were collected in three of the ten schools - referred to herein as Schools D, E, and F. Using the standard ICO procedure (see Appendix C), members of the project staff and two full-time data gatherers observed a random sample of from six to twelve success classes at each school both before and after implementation. It is important to note that in each of the Atlanta schools, Project Success staff members trained teachers and helped implement the program rather than the local principal. While the initial implementation of the program is probably unaffected by this change, long-term success of the Atlanta program may not be as good without more leadership by principals in the Atlanta System.

The results based on the ICO data are generally positive. Disruptive student behavior in the success classes at Schools D, E, and F are now much less common, and on-task behavior much more frequent than was the case before implementation. Comparison of teacher behavior at the three schools before and after implementation also shows positive changes.

A more detailed discussion of the data and a summary of training and monitoring activities in the three schools are presented below for all three schools. Schools D, E, and F all serve predominantly children from low-families.

SCHOOL D

Training

For four half-days in November, 1974, Project staff and a consultant trained the principal of School D, and the entire faculty of 15 teachers in grades one through five. Training generally followed the format that was used in the workshops for administrators (the contents of a workshop are described as part of Appendix A). Of course, no time was spent teaching the principal how to train the faculty since that was being done by the project. The children at School D are predominantly from lower-middle to lower class families, and also better off economically than students at Schools E and F.

Monitoring

A member of the project staff visited each class for about 30 minutes twice a week for the first several weeks of implementation, and about once every two-three weeks thereafter. After a classroom visitation, immediate individual feedback was given to the teacher; and, at the end of each full day of visitation, a conference was held with the principal to go over recommendations made to the teachers.

Observation and Analysis Design

Two full-time Project staff members collected ICO data over a six-day period in nin classrooms both before and after implementation; reliability data were gathered and are shown in Appendix C. For purposes of analysis, the four to six observations of each class during a given observation period were divided into three blocks (1, 2, or 3 sequential observations per block). An average score was then taken within each block for a given dependent variable (either reinforcement, punishment, disruption, or per cent time on task). This block variable was analyzed to determine if

changes occurred within the before or after training periods as well as between one period and the next.

Results

Mean rates of teacher reinforcement per student and total punishment both before and after training are presented in the first two rows of Table 1. On an average the nine teachers quadrupled their rate of reinforcement and decreased their rate of punishment seven fold. An analysis of variance indicated that both changes were significant; for reinforcement, $F(1,8) = 8.78$, $p < .01$, for punishment, $F(1,8) = 40.30$, $p < .01$.

It is evident that while the nine teachers were implementing the Success Technique they were far more positive than punitive in dealing with their students.

Means for student behavior both before and after the teachers were trained are presented in the last two rows of Table 1. There is a dramatic and significant improvement in student behavior. The rate of disruptions per student was cut to one fourth its pre-implementation level, $F(1,8) = 95.87$, $p < .01$; and the per cent of time the students remained on task increased approximately 38 per cent, $F(1,8) = 130.92$, $p < .01$.

TABLE I

Mean Teacher and Student Behavior
at School D
Before and After Training

Behavior Observed	Before Training	After Training
Teacher Behavior		
Reinforcement Per Student (15 min.)	0.12	0.55*
Total Punishment (15 min.)	14.85	2.15*
Student Behavior		
Disruptions Per Student (15 min.)	2.77	0.57*
Per Cent Time on Task	29.85	68.56*

* Statistically significant change in this behavior from pre test.

SCHOOL E

School E is one of the largest elementary schools in the Atlanta System with approximately 40 teachers and over 1,000 students in grades one through seven. The school serves a low-income neighborhood that is predominantly Black. Most of the children attending the school come from a federally subsidized housing project which is nearby.

Training

In October, 1974, the principal and the faculty of School E agreed to implement Positive Contingency Management. Two members of the project staff trained the faculty and the principal during two, two-day workshops; one on October 30-31, the other November 4-5, 1974. One half of the teachers were trained at each workshop. The workshops were similar to those conducted for administrators and detailed in Appendix A. A member of the project staff conducted a live demonstration of the technique and the same conceptual presentation and small group discussion form were adhered to.

Monitoring

Several project staff members assisted in the start up of the program at School E. This assistance included purchasing supplies for the activity room, having Success Record Cards produced, and producing signs with classroom rules on them for each class. In addition, four members of the project staff visited the school on a regular basis for the first month of operation to observe and provide feedback in each teacher's class. Additional visitations occurred in later months on a less frequent basis. The staff members also consulted with the principal and kept him informed as to the progress of the implementation.

Observation and Analysis Design

Two members of the project staff used the In-class Observation procedure described in Appendix D in a random sample of eleven classrooms that imple-

mented the program at School E. Again, reliability between observers was high (see Appendix C). From four to six observations were made before and several weeks after program implementation. The individual observations were combined to create for each classroom three observations before and three observations following implementation. This block factor was included in the analysis so that we could assess differences with the pre and post test intervals as well as between one interval and the next.

Results

Means for teacher and student behavior both before and after training and implementation are presented in Table 2 for School E. It is evident in Table 2 that both teachers and students changed dramatically as a result of the implementation of Positive Contingency Management. Teachers reinforced eight times more often following implementation, $F(1,10) = 16.99$, $p < .01$. Teachers also reduced the rate of punishment to one third the pre-implementation level, $F(1,10) = 16.37$, $p < .01$. These large changes in teacher behavior also resulted in large and reliable changes in student behavior. Students were disruptive about one fourth as often, $F(1,10) = 14.93$, $p < .01$, and increased 23 percentage points in attention to assigned academic exercises, $F(1,19) = 34.86$, $p < .01$. Clearly, the effects on both students and teacher at School E were large and positive, and the atmosphere changed from a fairly negative one to a warm and positive one.

TABLE 2

Mean Teacher and Student Behavior
at School E
Before and After Training

Behavior Observed	Before Training	After Training
Teacher Behavior		
Reinforcement Per Student (15 min.)	0.05	0.43*
Total Punishment (15 min.)	3.73	1.12*
Student Behavior		
Disruptions Per Student (15 min.)	1.90	0.56*
Per Cent Time on Task	57	80*

* Statistically significant change in this behavior from pre test.

SCHOOL F

School F is a small elementary school serving children in the Northwest section of Atlanta. The children at School F are predominantly from lower-income families.

Training

The teachers and principal at School F were trained in a two-day workshop on November 6-7, 1974, by two members of the project staff. The workshop was conducted in a similar format to the workshop for administrators with a live demonstration, presentation of conceptual background, and minor group discussion of practical implementation problems.

Monitoring

Two members of the project staff assisted teachers set up and implement the program. The project staff selected and bought activity reinforcers, helped make up and print classroom rules, and provided each teacher with constructive feedback as to his/her success with the implementation. The principal of School F was kept informed of the progress of the implementation, but played a small role in the implementation.

Observation and Analysis Design

Two project success staff members observed in a random sample of eight classrooms at School F both before and after implementation of the program; reliabilities are reported in Appendix C. Three observations were made at each observation interval. These observation blocks were included in the analysis. Observations occurred for two weeks in late October, and again approximately two months following implementation.

Results

The mean teacher and student behaviors both before and after implementation are presented in Table 3. Teachers increased their rate of reinforcement only slightly, and the change was not significant statistically, $F(1,7) = 2.26$, $p > .05$. There was a large and reliable drop in punishment, however, from over five punishments per fifteen minutes to less than a half a punishment in fifteen minutes (or one punishment per half hour), $F(1,7) = 49.98$, $p < .01$. Students in the classes at School F also changed with one third as many disruptions, $F(1,7) = 18.71$, $p < .01$, and an increase in attention to assigned tasks by 25 percentage points so that at post test 84 percent of the students were attending to teacher-directed activities, $F(1,7) = 27.76$, $p < .01$. Thus, at School F teachers did not reinforce any more than before training, but did reduce drastically the level of punishment. The result was a positive classroom atmosphere and large changes in student behavior.

SUMMARY

Results at these three elementary schools in Atlanta clearly indicate that the Success Technique continues to be a viable alternative to traditional classrooms in inner-city as well as outer-city areas. In each case, there were substantial changes in both teachers, and more importantly, in the behavior of the students. Our only concern at present is whether the schools that have implemented in the Atlanta System will be able to maintain successful programs without a more systematic and larger role of responsibility being assumed by the local principal. We are certain that Positive Contingency Management cannot be kept fully operational without strong and full support of the principal, and it appears that in several cases in the Atlanta School System, the principal has not accepted this responsibility.

TABLE 3

Mean Teacher and Student Behavior in Eight Classes
at School F
Before and After Training

Behavior Observed	Before Training	After Training
Teacher Behavior		
Reinforcement Per Student (15 minutes)	.[illegible]	.[illegible]
Verbal Punishment (15 minutes)	.[illegible]	.[illegible]*
Student Behavior		
Disruptions Per Student (15 minutes)	.[illegible]5	.[illegible]*
Per [illegible] on Task	5[illegible]	[illegible]4*

*Statistically significant change in this behavior from pre test.

ATTACHMENT TO APPENDIX B

(Analysis of variance tables for data discussed in Appendix B)

Analyses of Variance: School D

Teacher Behavior

REINFORCEMENTS PER STUDENT (15 minutes)

Source	df	Mean Square	F
Mean	1	6.080	
Treatment	1	2.509	8.77*
Blocks	2	0.089	1.20
Teacher	8	0.202	
Treatment x Blocks	2	0.206	4.68
Treatment x Teacher	8	0.286	
Blocks x Teacher	16	0.074	
Treatment x Blocks x Teacher	16	0.044	

TOTAL PUNISHMENTS (15 minutes)

Source	df	Mean Square	F
Mean	1	3901.50	
Treatment	1	2178.69	40.30**
Blocks	2	0.389	0.01
Teacher	8	97.875	
Treatment x Blocks	2	17.240	0.42
Treatment x Teacher	8	54.059	
Blocks x Teacher	16	36.639	
Treatment x Blocks x Teacher	16	40.862	

*$p < .05$

**$p < .01$

Analyses of Variance: School D

Student Behavior

DISRUPTIONS PER STUDENT (15 Minutes)

Source	df	Mean Square	F
Mean	1	149.80	
Treatment	1	65.38	96.14**
Blocks	2	0.18	0.42
Teacher	8	0.91	
Treatment x Blocks	2	0.04	0.09
Treatment x Teacher	8	0.68	
Blocks x Teacher	16	0.43	
Treatment x Blocks x Teacher	16	0.45	

PER CENT TIME ON TASK

Source	df	Mean Square	F
Mean	1	130734.19	
Treatment	1	20222.68	130.92**
Blocks	2	13.13	0.09
Teacher	8	689.95	
Treatment x Blocks	2	6.79	0.04
Treatment x Teacher	8	154.47	
Blocks x Teacher	16	144.96	
Treatment x Blocks x Teacher	16	173.96	

*$p < .05$

**$p < .01$

Analyses of Variance: School E

Teacher Behavior

REINFORCEMENTS PER STUDENT (15 minutes)

Source	df	Mean Square	F
Mean	1	3.806	
Treatment	1	2.379	16.99**
Blocks	2	0.019	1.58
Teacher	10	0.166	
Treatment x Blocks	2	0.015	1.25
Treatment x Teacher	10	0.140	
Blocks x Teacher	20	.012	
Treatment x Blocks x Teacher	20	.012	

TOTAL PUNISHMENTS (15 minutes)

Source	df	Mean Square	F
Mean	1	388.07	
Treatment	1	111.80	16.37**
Blocks	2	6.53	1.42
Teacher	10	20.30	
Treatment x Blocks	2	1.35	0.27
Treatment x Teacher	10	6.83	
Blocks x Teacher	20	4.61	
Treatment x Blocks x Teacher	20	4.97	

*$p < .05$

**$p < .01$

Analyses of Variance: School E

Student Behavior

DISRUPTIONS PER STUDENT (15 minutes)

Source	df	Mean Square	F
Mean	1	99.728	
Treatment	1	29.855	14.91**
Blocks	2	0.495	0.42
Teacher	10	2.852	
Treatment x Blocks	2	0.145	0.18
Treatment x Teacher	10	2.003	
Blocks x Teacher	20	1.200	
Treatment x Blocks x Teacher	20	0.786	

PER CENT TIME ON TASK

Source	df	Mean Square	F
Mean	1	30.681	
Treatment	1	0.889	34.19**
Blocks	2	0.006	0.38
Teacher	10	0.054	
Treatment x Blocks	2	0.035	2.19
Treatment x Teacher	10	0.026	
Blocks x Teacher	20	0.016	
Treatment x Blocks x Teacher	20	0.016	

*$p < .05$

**$p < .01$

Analyses of Variance: School F

Teacher Behavior

REINFORCEMENTS PER STUDENT (15 minutes)

Source	df	Mean Square	F
Mean	1	3.162	
Treatment	1	0.056	2.24
Blocks	2	0.032	1.68
Teacher	7	0.128	
Treatment x Blocks	2	0.003	0.25
Treatment x Teacher	7	0.025	
Blocks x Teacher	14	0.019	
Treatment x Blocks x Teacher	14	0.012	

TOTAL PUNISHMENTS (15 minutes)

Source	df	Mean Square	F
Mean	1	420.08	
Treatment	1	336.02	50.00**
Blocks	2	7.22	0.59
Teacher	7	8.86	
Treatment x Blocks	2	4.54	0.43
Treatment x Teacher	7	6.72	
Blocks x Teacher	14	12.19	
Treatment x Blocks x Teacher	14	10.61	

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

Analyses of Variance: School F

Student Behavior

DISRUPTIONS PER STUDENT (15 minutes)

Source	df	Mean Square	F
Mean	1	51.48	
Treatment	1	10.63	18.65**
Blocks	2	0.58	1.41
Teacher	7	0.78	
Treatment x Blocks	2	0.54	1.54
Treatment x Teacher	7	0.57	
Blocks x Teacher	14	0.41	
Treatment x Blocks x Teacher	14	0.35	

PER CENT TIME ON TASK

Source	df	Mean Square	F
Mean	1	24.54	
Treatment	1	0.76	28.15**
Blocks	2	0.009	0.90
Teacher	7	0.028	
Treatment x Blocks	2	0.003	0.15
Treatment x Teacher	7	0.027	
Blocks x Teacher	14	0.010	
Treatment x Blocks x Teacher	14	0.020	

*$p < .05$

**$p < .01$

APPENDIX C

Description of In-Class Observation Procedure
and
Report on Inter-rater Reliability for Year V

PROJECT SUCCESS ENVIRONMENT

IN-CLASS OBSERVATION PROCEDURE

A complete observation requires approximately 30 minutes during which the class is engaged in academic activity. If for some reason (such as a message being delivered or the teacher being called out of the classroom) academic activity is interrupted, the observation is suspended until teaching resumes. The observer locates himself to one side, but not in back of the classroom, and refrains from interacting with either the teacher or the students during an observation.

Within the 30-minute observation period, two different observation procedures (described in detail below) are used. The teacher's use of positive and negative events (non-technically, reinforcement and punishment) as well as the frequency of student disruptions are observed using one procedure; student attention is observed using another method. The observer begins recording positive events, negative events, and disruptions for exactly $7\frac{1}{2}$ minutes, switches to attention for approximately 15 minutes, and then completes the observation of positive and negative events and disruptions for a final $7\frac{1}{2}$ minutes. The observation is split in order to obtain more typical samples of behavior.

The observer uses a stopwatch as a timing device and records the behaviors of interest on the IN-CLASS (ICO) RECORD SHEET appended to this description. Before an observation begins, the number of students present is recorded in the appropriate space at the top right of the sheet.

Teacher Administered Positive and Negative Events, and Student Disruptions

For exactly 7½ minutes on two occasions (a total of 15 minutes), the observer counts and records each instance of the teacher administering either a positive or a negative event and each instance of student disruption, all at the same time; however, the guidelines for recording each of these three behaviors are presented separately as follows:

Positive Events - The observer records every instance in which the teacher administers a positive event by circling the lowest uncircled number in the appropriate box of the ICO Record Sheet. The average number of positive events administered per student in a 15-minute period constitutes the criterion measure, and this ratio is obtained by dividing the total number of positive events administered by the number of students present during the observation. Teacher behaviors recorded as positive events are:

1. Verbal priase - Any verbal behavior on part of teacher that indicates approval, commendation, or achievement on the part of a child such as "good," "that's great," "fine job."
2. Granting privileges - Any teacher behavior which signifies that a child can perform a preferred task that is not readily available to all members of class, such as leading the the line to lunch.
3. Positive physical contact - Physical contact between teacher and child initiated by teacher that appears pleasant, including embracing, patting on head or shoulder, holding arm, taking hand, kissing, etc.
4. Consumables and tokens - Delivery by teacher of a consumable such as candy or a token that can be traded for a consumable

or a preferred activity.

Negative Events - The observer records every instance in which the teacher administers a negative event by circling the lowest uncircled number in the appropriate box of the ICO RECORD SHEET. The total number of negative events administered in 15 minutes constitutes the criterion measure. Teacher behaviors recorded as negative events are:

1. Verbal criticism or sarcasm - Any verbal behavior on part of the teacher that indicates disapproval or condemnation of the behavior of a child such as "that's bad," "you're awful," "don't bother me," or "you think you're something don't you."
2. Withdrawing privileges - Any teacher behavior signifying that a child can no longer perform a task that was once available to all children, such as not permitting a child to go to recess.
3. Isolation - Placing a child in a corner of the room or outside the room and thus out of the context of the class.
4. Aversive physical contact - Physical contact between teacher and child initiated by teacher that appears unpleasant, such as spanking, slapping, shaking, grabbing, etc.

Disruptions - The observer continually scans the entire class looking for instances of disruptive student behavior and recording each of them by circling the lowest uncircled number in the appropriate box of the ICO RECORD SHEET.

An instance of student behavior is recorded as disruptive if it includes: talking or being out of seat without permission; generating loud noises, and disturbing other students either verbally, or by means of physical contact, or by handling another student's possessions. In

general, disruption encompasses any unsolicited student behavior likely to distract other students from their assigned tasks. A single student is not recorded as disruptive more often than once every ten seconds; i.e., continuing disruptive behavior on the part of a single student (such as fighting) is recorded no more than once per ten-second interval. The criterion measure is the average number of disruptions per student per 15 minutes, obtained by dividing the total number of disruptions recorded by the number of students present during the observation session.

Attention to Task - Attention to task is determined between observations of teacher behavior and student disruptions. Each student in the class is observed separately, one time only, for 20 seconds and classified as either involved, medium involved, or uninvolved. At the beginning of the 20 seconds a stop watch is started and the observer begins counting the number of seconds that the student is not paying attention to his assigned academic task. If there is no assigned academic task, unless the student busies himself with some academic work, he is counted as being off-task. The counting of off-task seconds is most conveniently done on the fingers. The seconds of off-task behavior do not have to be sequential. At the end of 20 seconds, the number of off-task seconds is noted and the smallest uncircled number in the appropriate box of the ICO RECORD SHEET is circled. The appropriate box is determined by the number of seconds a given student is off-task, where each student observed is classified as INVOLVED (0 to 5 seconds off-task), MEDIUM INVOLVED (6 to 15 seconds off-task), or UNINVOLVED (16 to 20 seconds off-task). It requires approximately 15 minutes to observe the attention to task of each student in a class of 30.

Observations of students who have been assigned non-academic tasks is not allowed. If a student is assigned a non-academic task throughout the time it takes to observe the remainder of the class, then that student is not observed for attention to task.

The total number of students recorded as involved is added to one-half the number of students recorded as medium involved. The ratio of this sum to the total number of students observed for attention is used as an estimate of the percent of time the students are on task and paying attention. This percentage constitutes the criterion measure.

INTER-RATER RELIABILITY, YEAR V

Four regular members of the project staff and four paraprofessionals collected in-class observational data during Year V. All of the data gatherers were trained in the ICO procedures during Year V by a project consultant.

To formally estimate inter-rater reliability, two data gatherers used the ICO procedure to observe simultaneously in all classes at a particular school while recording their observations independently of one another. The percentage agreement between the raters was obtained for reinforcement, punishment, disruption, and attention respectively at both pre and post test at five of the six schools observed during Year V.

The reliability data for each school are presented in Table 1. Clearly, there was good agreement among raters. Most coefficients are above .80 and only four of 32 are less than .60.

TABLE 1

Percentage Agreement between Pairs of Data Gatherers
at Five Schools Observed during Year V
(at both pre and post test)

School	No. of Classes	Teacher Behavior		Student Behavior	
		Reinforcement	Punishment	Disruptions	Attention
B & C					
Pre	9	.76	.82	.82	.86
Post	5	.73	.58	.70	.90
D					
Pre	9	.88	.88	.96	.69
Post	9	.79	.83	.88	.85
E					
Pre	4	.50	.50	.96	.81
Post	5	.50	.94	.84	.95
F					
Pre	6	.64	.77	.83	.87
Post	8	.78	.89	.78	.84

Project Success Environment

IN-CLASS OBSERVATION (ICO) RECORDING SHEET

TEACHER: _____ A.M. ☐ P.M. ☐

DATE: _____ No. Present: _____

REINFORCEMENT											
Academic						Conduct					
1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	25	26	27	28	29	30
31	32	33	34	35	36	31	32	33	34	35	36
37	38	39	40	41	42	37	38	39	40	41	42
43	44	45	46	47	48	43	44	45	46	47	48

PUNISHMENT			
1	2	3	4
5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16
17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28
29	30	31	32

Total Reinforcement _____

DISRUPTION														
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45
46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60
61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75
76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90

ATTENTION																	
INVOLVED (0-5)						MED. INVO. (6-15)						UNINVOLVED (16-20)					
1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9	10	11	12	7	8	9	10	11	12	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	13	14	15	16	17	18	13	14	15	16	17	18
19	20	21	22	23	24	19	20	21	22	23	24	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	25	26	27	28	29	30	25	26	27	28	29	30

NO. INVOLVED: _____ + 1/2 NO. MED. INVOLVED: _____ = _____ NO. ON TASK

NO. ON TASK: _____ ÷ NO. OBSERVED: _____ = _____ % TIME INVOLVED

APPENDIX D

The Implementation Checklist

A Validation Instrument for Schools
Implementing
Positive Contingency Management

Project SUCCESS: Implementation Checklist

A T L A N T A P U B L I C S C H O O L S

INSTRUCTIONAL PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

Project SUCCESS Environment
892 Vedado Way, NE
Atlanta, Georgia 30308

In order to determine how well the Success Technique has been implemented in a school, the project staff has developed the following validation instrument. In addition to validating the degree of successful implementation, this checklist also provides the principal with feedback about individual components of the project. A member of the project staff will rate the school in each of the categories listed on the next page. Each category will be rated on a scale of 5 (excellent implementation) to 1 (poor implementation).

PROJECT SUCCESS: Implementation Checklist

I. School-Wide Implementation of Success Technique

A. Principal

1. What percent of time does the principal spend in the classroom monitoring the use of technique and providing feedback to teachers? (5 = 30 min./teacher/week) (1 = No supervision).
2. Does the principal play an active role in administering the technique school wide (hold regular meetings with teachers and pupils relevant to the progress and problems of technique? Does the principal assume responsibility for maintenance, supervision and scheduling of the activity room)?
3. Does the principal monitor the effectiveness of the back-up reinforcement system (is he sensitive to satiation; are games, puzzles, etc., frequently changed in the activity room; how pupils feel about activity room; when tokens lose their power? Does the principal plan special reinforcers to supplement activity room?
4. Has the principal made a consistent effort to maintain a high level of enthusiasm throughout the school?

B. Backup Reinforcement System

1. How often may pupils earn time in the activity room?
2. Are there provisions so that all pupils have access to an appropriate activity room for their age level?
3. Is the activity room supervised on a regular basis?
4. Are materials and equipment attractive and well maintained?
5. Are activities effective reinforcers?

II. Classroom Implementation of Success Technique

A. Teachers

1. Are teachers positive? (Do they use verbal praise and tokens to reinforce student's behavior?)
2. Are teachers consistent in their treatment of pupils? (are rules up and followed/ do pupils know what to expect?)
3. Are teacher's attitudes relevant to the technique positive (Do they enjoy the system? Do they think it is working well or can work well with more experience?)

B. Pupils

1. Are the pupils on task? (5 = 75 percent or better on task; 1 = less than 40 percent).
2. Are the pupils motivated by the reinforcement system? (Do they seem eager to earn checks? Do they spend their tokens?)
3. Can the pupils explain the system? (Do they know the rules? Do they understand how and what earns tokens? Can they explain the grouping system?)

C. Physical Arrangement of Classroom

1. Are pupils sub-grouped?
2. Do pupils rotate by use of Success Wheels (for a minimum of one regular instructional block)?
3. Are interest stations maintained and used on a regular basis?
4. Is reinforcement chart being used and is it up to date (is there clear evidence that pupil earning power is being monitored consistently?

PROJECT SUCCESS ENVIRONMENT

I. School-Wide Implementation of Success Technique

Principal				Backup Reinforcement System				
Time in Class	Leadership	Monitors Reinforcement System	Motivation of Staff	Frequency of Use of A.R.	Age Related Reinforcers	Supv. of A.R.	Maintenance of A.R.	Effective Reinforcers
	Average/Category							

Overall Rating of School Based on All Categories

PROJECT SUCCESS ENVIRONMENT

II. Classroom Implementation of Success Technique

	Teacher			Pupil			Classroom			
Teacher Name	Positive	Consistent	Attitude	On Task	Motivated	Understands System	Sub Group	Wheel	Station	Reinf. Chart
Total										
Average										
Average/Category										